

THE WAR IN MEXICO.

Herald Special Reports from the Seat of Revolution.

Another Battle Near Monterey—The Victory of the Juaristas Turned Into Defeat.

TRIUMPH OF THE REVOLUTIONISTS.

Trevino's Ruse—Surprise and Slaughter of the Government Troops.

CEVALLOS DEFEATED NEAR MIER.

TELEGRAMS TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.

We have received the following special despatches from the HERALD correspondents at Camargo and Matamoros:—

CAMARGO, Mexico, June 3, 1872. Via BROWNVILLE, Texas, June 3, 1872.

After the fight near Monterey, on the 30th ult., which was apparently a victory for the government troops, General Trevino retreated, leaving the Juaristas in possession of the battlefield. The latter were so highly elated over their temporary advantage that they neglected the necessary precautions against surprise. General Corrella, the commander of the Juaristas, imagined he had given a crushing blow to Trevino, and was therefore secure from further attack. He sent despatches to the Juarez government announcing his victory and the total annihilation of the revolutionists.

Sudden Attack.

But on the following day (May 31) General Trevino rallied all his forces, which had been purposely scattered in order to avoid the concentrated fire of the government troops. He attacked General Corrella in the suburbs of Monterey. The Juaristas were completely taken by surprise and made hasty preparations for resistance; but before they recovered from the shock of the sudden attack and made a fearful slaughter.

NO QUARTER.

They gave with some few exceptions no quarters to the enemy, and the entire government force was either killed and wounded or scattered. General Corrella lost everything—all his guns, munitions, siege trains and even his personal baggage.

Thus ends the campaign of the government against the revolutionists of the northern frontier after two months' preparation.

It is supposed that General Trevino's retreat on the first day was merely a ruse to lull the government troops into security and then renew the battle.

THE REVOLUTION REVEALED.

The revolutionists are highly exultant over their victory. They claim that it has given a new impetus to the revolution, and that the Northern frontier will once more pass under their control. There is nothing known about the movements of General Trevino since his victory, but it is anticipated that he will return to the border.

The government troops in this place are under orders to move at a moment's notice in expedition of the enemy.

General Cevallos Defeated by the Revolutionists Near Mier.

MATAMOROS, Mexico, June 3, 1872.

Letters from Ringgold report that General Cevallos' advance has been checked by the revolutionists. He was defeated and driven back near Mier. General Quiroga, with a revolutionary force, still holds Cevallos, the principal city on the road to Monterey.

Matamoros Occupied by Juarez's Troops.

SAN FRANCISCO, Cal., June 2, 1872.

The occupation of Matamoros by the federal troops is confirmed. All Western Mexico is now pacified.

MEXICAN THIEVES IN TEXAS.

Depredations Resumed by the Banditti—United States Troops in Pursuit.

TELEGRAMS TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.

The HERALD correspondent at Brownsville has forwarded us the following special despatch:—

BROWNVILLE, Texas, June 3, 1872.

The military operations on the Mexican side had stopped cattle stealing temporarily; but it has recommenced on as large a scale as ever. Many head of cattle have lately been driven off by Mexican thieves. A force of United States cavalry and mounted infantry are going out in pursuit of the banditti. The arrival of a commissioner to investigate the depredations is anxiously expected.

CUBA.

Movements of Insurgent Chiefs—A Spanish War Vessel Run Into and Sunk by Another.

TELEGRAMS TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.

Havana, June 3, 1872.

It is reported that the insurgent chiefs Salome, Hernandez, Sangalli, Faneche, Vega and several others arrived safely at Jamaica. Hernandez, however, after the arrival there, died of fever. Salome and Vega are unfit for active service, owing to their wounds.

A Spanish Man-of-War in Search of the Edgar Stewart Come to Grief.

SANTIAGO DE CUBA, March 28, 1872. Via Havana, June 3, 1872.

The merchant steamer Clara, temporarily fitted up as a man-of-war, while cruising in search of the Edgar Stewart, ran into the Spanish gunboat Celago last night, striking her in the fore chain and carrying away her foremast. The Celago sank six minutes afterwards. Her crew and money box were all saved and taken on board the Clara, which was slightly injured.

THE CLAIMS CRISIS IN ENGLAND.

Premier Gladstone and Earl Granville Report the Condition of the Negotiations to Parliament.

The Indirect Claims Regarded as Withdrawn by America.

The Supplemental Article Closes the Subject "Against Misunderstanding in Present or Future"—Cabinet Communications with Minister Schenck—Comments of Disraeli and Alarm of the Opposition—Earl Russell to Move His Address to the Crown—Proposed Cession of the Geneva Arbitration.

TELEGRAMS TO THE NEW YORK HERALD.

LONDON, June 3, 1872.

In the House of Commons to-day Mr. Gladstone apologized for not being able to make a definite statement with regard to the negotiations with the United States as he had promised the House. The postponement of the day of adjournment by the American Senate rendered a full explanation impossible. As for the supplemental article to the Treaty of Washington, he would assure the members that it did not leave the subject of the indirect claims, present or future, open for misunderstanding hereafter, and in this view Mr. Schenck, the American Minister, coincided. He gave an account of the preceding negotiations, and said the suggestion was made that England should draft an additional article, whereby she was to make certain agreements for the future, and the United States was to undertake not to press the indirect claims. This suggestion was accepted and acted on. The difficulty which had since arisen did not touch the main point.

Mr. Disraeli called attention to the fact that the Premier had omitted to state whether arbitration was to proceed on the 15th inst.

Mr. Gladstone replied that this had been kept secret in view of the negotiations.

Mr. Horsman put the following question:—“Has the government any reason to suppose that the United States government is inclined to withdraw from Secretary Fish's position that concessions from England must precede any settlement?”

Mr. Gladstone replied:—“The understanding is that the United States make no claim touching indirect damages at Geneva. These words Her Majesty's government believes but not meaning, and in that Mr. Schenck agrees with us.”

Mr. Osborne considered that the explanations amounted to nothing. The House and the country were not satisfied. He hoped that a distinct declaration would be extorted from the government that unless the indirect claims were fully, fairly and immediately withdrawn Great Britain would refuse to proceed with arbitration. (Cheers.)

Mr. Bouverie said he had heard the statement of the Premier with alarm. He hoped the government would not accept Minister Schenck's verbal assurance.

Viscount Bury gave notice that he should move an address to the Queen similar to that of Earl Russell in the House of Lords for the withdrawal of Great Britain from the arbitration unless the indirect claims are abandoned by the United States.

Mr. WYNDHAM inquired whether care had been taken that indirect claims should not be raised.

Mr. ORWAY said they had been warned of the danger of fresh engagements with the United States, and he wanted to know whether any new engagements had been made or accepted by the government.

Mr. G. B. GREGORY, member from East Sussex, begged to know if the government had the assurance of the American Minister, Mr. Schenck, in writing.

To the latter question Mr. Gladstone answered, “No.” He added that honorable members seemed to think that some price had been paid the United States for withdrawing the indirect claims. This impression was erroneous. He explained at some length the word “consideration,” which he admitted was used in the supplemental article; but the consideration was a covenant between the two nations for the future, and was reciprocal. He declined to discuss the question of pressing the withdrawal of the indirect claims while negotiations were still in progress to obviate the necessity.

THE FEARS ON THE CRISIS.

In the House of Lords Earl GRANVILLE also made a statement with regard to the condition of the negotiations at Washington. Communications, he said, continued to be exchanged, but without result, and it was impossible to predict what the result would be. The lawyers of the crown had concluded that there was no difference of opinion between the two nations touching the withdrawal of the indirect claims. The only point in dispute was as to engagements for the future. He was aware of the difficulties of the moment, and hoped they would be overcome.

Earl Russell said the time had come when plain words were desirable, and he gave notice that he should to-morrow press his motion for an address to the Queen for the withdrawal of Great Britain from arbitration.

Lord Cairns denounced the supplemental article as pregnant with danger.

Lord Wrentham was severe on the government for sheltering themselves under the crown lawyers.

Earl GRANVILLE defended the act, saying it was proper to show the good will of the country toward America while the treaty was hanging in the balance. England had only evaded Russia, Austria, Prussia and other Powers in similar acts of courtesy.

THE QUESTION IN WASHINGTON.

General Canvass of the Situation—Official Opinion of Granville's Position as Set Forth in His Note—A Feeling of Deep Indignation Among Senators Particularly—The Implied Charges of Bad Faith Against Our Government—What Will Be the Result?

WASHINGTON, June 3, 1872.

There is nothing absolutely new in the position of affairs concerning the Treaty. The note of Lord Granville of Saturday last, printed in these despatches yesterday, is to-night the topic of conversation in official circles and it has awakened the deepest indignation on the part of the Senators especially. The decided terms by which the British Foreign Secretary holds that by the Senate's amendment to the original supplementary article, the bad faith and wilful misconduct imputed by the United States to the former British Ministry are brought within the scope of pecuniary compensation, are quoted as evidence of the bad faith of Granville and his colleagues in pressing not to understand the modified article at all, while at the same time they fasten a construction upon it that goes beyond its fair and honest meaning.

It is held here to be an insult to this country to suggest, as Lord Granville does, that while the British government understands it to be the view of this government that such cases are not a fit subject of pecuniary compensation, that government is fearful that we shall endeavor, nevertheless, to exact pecuniary compensation with respect to the allegation that Mr. Fish believes the Senate article to be capable of improvement, and has so informed Minister Thornton. The aroused Senators are content to let the Secretary himself dispose of familiar with during the action of the committee and the Senate upon the proposed and adopted.

As for Granville's own article a member of the

Committee on Foreign Relations, to whose charge it was committed, grimly remarked to-night that but for the confidential nature of the subject it would have been in all probability referred to a committee of schoolmasters for a first revision before the other amendments were made that were not simply verbal. The assumption of the British Cabinet that this government does not believe there is such a difference between the two countries concerning the substance of the matter as to prevent an agreement on the language in which to express it if time be allowed, is considered to mean nothing more than an appeal for further time in which to move the government from the position which the English government desire it to occupy, for nothing, it is argued, can be clearer than the language and the intent of the Senate's article, and there is no misunderstanding here upon the point that we are not to press our claims for indirect losses under that article.

Lord Granville, it is believed, has distinctly declined to sign a treaty based upon that article for the double reason that it not only fails to coincide with their own views, but is equally foreign to our own declared principles. This is understood to mean nothing less than a further change of phraseology in the proposed treaty, with the express object of debarring the United States from every imagined chance of pressing claims at Geneva which they do not desire to press and have no intention of pressing, and is but the diplomatic way of intimating that we are not to be trusted to the extent of a single word in the new treaty which would admit of any other than the most rigid construction. It is with the view of wringing verbal concessions from our government in respect of the new article that Lord Granville inferentially demands a postponement of the arbitration, and though the hollowness of the reasons advanced for this postponement are fully appreciated, these reasons have such a colorable foundation in the hurry and possible imperfections of cypher despatches by telegraph, that our government cannot well decline the postponement, and thus, escape the important question of the British Cabinet for modification of the article which cannot be granted. Hence it may be stated, upon grounds of authority, that the contemplated business of arbitration will not proceed on the 15th of June, as provided in the original treaty, but that the arbitration will be adjourned to a subsequent date.

But this postponement of the immediate proceedings is in no manner likely to affect the final result, there being no room to doubt that England will never resume the arbitration without vital changes in the supplemental treaty, and it being equally certain that the President will never propose, nor the Senate agree to, any modification whatever.

THE TAMMANY RING.

The Cases of Tweed, Connolly, Ingersoll & Co. Before Judge Hogeboom.

ALBANY, N. Y., June 3, 1872.

In the Circuit Court, Judge Hogeboom presiding, the case of the People of the State against William M. Tweed, implicated with Ingersoll and others, came up at noon to-day on the demurrer of the defendant. The case was argued by Mr. Ingersoll, who joined in November last. Wheeler H. Peckham appeared for the people, and W. O. Bartlett, David Dudley Field and John H. Reynolds for the defendant.

Mr. Bartlett, in opening the argument for the defendant, said it was contended that the county of New York held no corporate right to sue and be sued, and if that proposition was not found to be the case of the people failed. He sharply criticized the manner in which this suit was brought through a bureau of correction, and by the transfer of the office of Attorney General to the City of New York. He then proceeded to show the independent position occupied by the county, its powers and duties, and insisted that the county of New York had always been recognized from the time of the colonies as a corporate body.

After some further argument to sustain the points made by him, Mr. Bartlett concluded. It was then agreed upon that S. G. Courtney should address the Court in behalf of Connolly, W. H. Peckham in behalf of the people, and D. D. Field close in behalf of both Tweed and Connolly, their cases being exactly identical. In the case of Fields, that being somewhat different from the other two, the case was argued by Mr. Courtney, who was assisted by Mr. Peckham. The Court then took a recess until 3:15 o'clock P. M.

On the resumption of the Court, S. G. Courtney made an argument on the demurrer on the part of Richard B. Connolly. In offering his argument he referred to the decision of Judge Learned reducing the case of the county of New York to the matter of the Corporation of the City of New York, and said that this demurrer is well taken, and must be sustained, unless the passions and prejudices of the hour shall have influence on the Court. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that his client, Connolly, even though he is not a party to the case, has been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Courtney, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

Mr. Peckham, in reply, said that the case was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable. He then read the points made in his brief to the effect that if his client had been nothing to show that he did any wrong, as he acted officially, it was not a judicial error, for which he was not amenable.

divided it among themselves, not responsible to anybody. They clearly are the guilty parties. Judge Hogeboom asked if the complaint charged that the defendants knew these claims were fraudulent.

Mr. O